

AMERICAN TROOPS IN BOSNIA A DANGEROUS PROPOSITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to come to the House floor today, being a leader in this Congress, to speak against placing United States ground troops in Bosnia. Having listened to the President's address last night, I feel compelled to speak to not only the Members listening back in their offices but to the American people as well.

On October 30, 1995, this House voted overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion on the Buyer-McHale resolution, and it was approved by a vote of 315 to 103. Ninety-three members of the Democratic caucus, almost half, supported the proposition that expressed a sense of this Congress that U.S. ground troops should not be a part of a peace agreement in the Balkans. This resolution passed because the President's plan is ill-conceived, poorly defined, and highly dangerous.

It is ill-conceived because, over 2 years ago, the President promised 25,000 U.S. troops to enforce a future peace agreement. The President made this commitment without knowing the mission or the conditions of a peace agreement.

Peacing 25,000 United States troops on the ground to implement an agreement and to make an enforced peace is ill-conceived because the United States forces have lost the protection of neutrality after having bombed the Bosnian Serbs and promising to arm and train the Bosnian Moslems. U.S. troops, having lost this protection of neutrality, will become targets and casualties on the ground.

The implementation plan has been poorly defined. What is the mission of the NATO force? We need very clear objectives. What are the criteria for success? What is the exit strategy? A date set for withdrawal in 1 year is no exit strategy. Will the rules of engagement allow the force to accomplish the mission? How do we prevent the "mission creep" that we learned in Somalia that may escalate United States involvement in the Balkans beyond the time period which the President has set, and how do we keep United States troops from conducting nation-building exercises?

This implementation plan is also highly dangerous in that the United States and NATO forces will enforce an agreement that is politically unsustainable in a region of the world that has a long history of all sides exercising vengeance and retribution on one another. This is a long-term ethnic and religious conflict that could take generations to cure.

That is why the President of France has indicated that NATO's involvement in the Balkans could be 20 years, 20 years. Now the President is saying, we

are only going in for 1 year, and we have this exit strategy. Twenty years. Think of this. It is generational.

Now, the President last night made a good speech, but I would submit a good speech does not make good foreign policy. Whether it is mass murder or ethnic cleansing, the rape and the pillage and the plunder, the destruction are all violent to America's values. But if our foreign policy followed our heart and emotion, then U.S. troops would become the world's policeman and we would find ourselves in over 67 hot spots throughout the world. I do not believe America wants U.S. troops to be the world's policeman.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we tie U.S. troops and their commitments on foreign soil to vital national security interests. Mr. Speaker, that is a lesson we learned in Somalia, that when a nation, when one of our own, our finest sons or daughters take an oath to lay down their life for this country for liberties and economic freedoms that many people take for granted, we in this Congress must ensure, and that we believe in their solemn oath to make sure that their life is not given in vain, that it is tied to national security interests.

I am extremely disappointed to be standing here and have the President of the United States ignore the will of this Congress, for we have voted twice on this issue of Bosnia in saying no to sending troops. I resent the position that the President of the United States has placed the American people in, I resent the position in which he has placed these American troops, and I resent the position that he has placed this U.S. Congress in. I remain highly skeptical of this deployment, and I recognize that the President, as Commander in Chief, can send these troops.

The Framers of the Constitution created friction between the legislative body and the President. Do we have to have the friction? We are going to. We are going to, because the President has on the blinders. He has ignored the will of the American people and this Congress, and he is sending the troops.

We control the purse strings. So what are we going to do? Well, I do not agree with the President's foreign policy with regard to placing ground troops in Bosnia. I believe that we have a key and vital role to play in the peace process and that we should be providing our air power and sea power and logistics on the ground in Bosnia but not sending the troops; and we have a duty to support our troops, but will narrow the parameters, define the criteria to minimize the loss of life.

REJECT ISTOOK AND MCINTOSH ON LOBBYING REFORM LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Florida mentioned a few minutes ago, we will be resuming debate later today on the lobbying reform legislation. And, as he put it so well, I hope this House will reject all of the many amendments that are pending on this bill. Some have merit, but as the gentleman indicated, they will doom this bill. We do not need to risk that, and we should not.

As we resume consideration later today, it is especially important, I think, to understand what the amendments to be offered by my colleagues from Indiana and Oklahoma would do. I think once those amendments noticed by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] are understood, they will be rejected. However, we need to read them as they were once proposed, as a single legislative proposal. We can now not unscramble that egg.

Let me refer my colleagues to a statement made by that noted conservative columnist George Will about this proposal. He said, "It would make lawyers happy; it would erect a litigation-breeding regulatory regime of baroque complexity regarding political expression."

Now, why in the world would George Will say that about a proposal like this? Let me just give you a few examples of the terribly burdensome effect, the red-tape-breeding provisions of this legislation as it would affect what private organizations in America can do with their private money.

For example, the University of Georgia would be limited in how much contact it could have with Georgia's State government. That is because State colleges and universities that receive Federal grants would be regulated under this proposal and could only spend a limited amount on any kind of contacts with other governmental entities. The definition of governmental contact is very broad and includes State and local governments.

□ 1300

Another example. If the National Association of Counties has any contact with a Federal official about legislative or policy matters, then no county that is a member of NACO could receive Federal funds. Why is that? Well, under the McIntosh language, if a 501(c)(4) nonprofit like NACO engages in any lobbying, then it and all organizations that are affiliated with it are prohibited from receiving any kind of Federal grants, loans, or contracts.

Another example. A zealous, vigilante-type person could bring harassing lawsuits against State and local governments under this provision, as well as against universities, nonprofits, you name it. A cut of treble damage verdicts would be available to anybody that might wish to pursue such a lawsuit for violation of the McIntosh-Istook provisions under the False Claims Act. That is what would be put into the law by the McIntosh private citizen enforcement amendment.

A Federal grantee like General Motors, obviously a private company, would have to account to the Federal Government for every time any of its thousands of employees had any contact with a Federal, State, or local government official about virtually any issue, whether it is local zoning or fuel efficiency standards.

Looking at another well-known and worthy nonprofit organization, Mothers Against Drunk Driving would not be able to carry out its mission if this were to become law, because under the amendment's formula for the maximum allowable government relations expenditures, Mothers Against Drunk Driving could spend only 3 percent of its entire budget on contacts with all levels of government. It would simply cripple MADD's efforts to get stricter Federal, State, and local laws and enforcement against drunk driving.

But do not take my word for this. Let me read to my colleagues from a letter sent out yesterday in behalf of the presidents of 34 major research universities in this country from the Association of American Universities. And I quote:

The Istook-McIntosh-Erich legislation would impose a burdensome, new record-keeping mandate on our universities, some of which receive thousands of Federal grants for diverse purposes. For each grant, this legislation would require detailed and duplicative reports on political advocacy—even if the amount of advocacy did not exceed the prohibited threshold.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on, including a recent communication from the Red Cross about this. Let me just conclude by pointing out what our former colleague Mickey Edwards of Oklahoma had to say about this recently: "This is big brother with a vengeance." My colleagues, we should defeat these amendments.

AMERICA BETTER OFF WITH BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the House this morning about an article that appeared yesterday in USA Today. It was entitled "What Life Would Be Like In 2002 With A Balanced Budget." It is a survey of a number of different economists and analysts and consultants who have been asked about what the impact would be on our economy over a 7-year period of coming into balance with the Federal budget.

It starts out by saying,

Mortgage rates near 5 percent. An economy that purrs along with a steady jobless rate around 5.5 percent. A standard of living that's on the rise again because wages are finally growing at a decent rate. A trade surplus.

Economists are nearly unanimous in their answers that for most people, in fact 80 percent or more, life would be better. Says Michael Erlund, who is

chief economist at consultants MMS International, "I have to believe a rising tide does raise all boats. Probably 80 percent or more would gladly benefit" with a balanced budget that helps bolster the economy.

Todd Buchholz, author and economist who is the author of a book entitled "From Here to Economy" says, "I can tell you things will only get worse if we don't balance the budget or come close to that."

Now why is that? What is at the bottom of this? At the bottom of it is the ability of the Government to borrow in a way that sucks capital out of capital markets that would go to productive activity in the economy.

In other words, if there is a deficit that is running, right now the deficit is about \$164 billion, then it has to borrow that money in the capital markets. That means that that money is not available to be borrowed by individuals for the purchase of homes or consumer goods, or by businesses for capital investment that would create more jobs.

Because we do spend more than we collect, the Federal Government has to borrow from investors to pay its bills. The article goes on by saying it borrows by selling Treasury bonds, notes and bills on which it pays interest. That borrowing, most economists agree, keep interest rates higher than they would be otherwise.

I can tell you that the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank, Mr. Greenspan, testified before my committee, the Committee on the Budget, earlier in this year, and said that on average he believed that interest rates would drop 2 percent as the result of balancing the budget.

"The government is tapping into our savings pool," says Nancy Kimelman, chief economist at Investment Advisors Technical Data in Boston. It lures investors' money the only way that a borrower can, by offering tempting yields on bonds.

When you subtract the Government from the competition for investors money by balancing its budget, then the effect would be immediate and interest rates would head down. Here are some of the estimates.

Lawrence Meyer and Associates, which is a St. Louis-based economic consulting firm, estimates that by 2002 short-term interest rates would be close to 3 percent, as opposed to 5.4 percent today, and long-term rates would be just about 5 percent, versus 6.2 percent today.

With rates that low, the economy would surely be far better off. Businesses would invest more because they could borrow more at lower rates. Investment in computers, in buildings and equipment, would boost productivity even further.

There is another issue at stake here besides all of these economic benefits that would inure not only to the economy generally but to individual people, both in terms of lower interest rates that they would pay for mortgage pay-

ments and car payments and school tuition payments as well as the capital formation aspects that create a lot more jobs and a lot more opportunity. The other issue that I want to talk about with respect to a balanced budget is the one that goes to the question of how we define what Government should be, what its appropriate role is, and what its appropriate role ought to be in the American scene.

The way that this idea of a balanced budget comes into play with respect to that is that the most perfect way, the most compelling way, the most clarifying way to define as a people what we believe government's role ought to be is what we as a people are willing to pay for it on a pay-as-you-go basis. So that if we say to each other, to ourselves, look, we are only willing to spend what we are willing to pay for, then that is the most perfect way to define what this Government should be and should do. It also has the added benefit of not putting on our children the borrowing that we enter into and engage in today. It very perfectly defines what we ought to be as a government.

DEFEAT ISTOOK AMENDMENT TO LOBBY REFORM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my outrage with the Istook amendment we will be voting on that will impede with the fundamental right of Americans—particularly nonprofit organizations to advocate with their Government—their Representatives.

Let me first make it clear that I find this whole censorship effort reprehensible. But what makes it truly despicable is that it is specifically crafted to deal only with certain kinds of grants from the Government—the kind that go to people they do not like. People who might dare to oppose their extremist agenda.

What I mean is this: Mr. ISTOOK's own testimony on behalf of his original amendment cited two Supreme Court decisions in which the court specifically stated that there are two kinds of Federal benefits that put taxpayer dollars in an organization's pocket: Grants, and tax exemptions and deductions. The Supreme Court came right out and said it point blank. Both Mr. ISTOOK's original and more controversial amendment and the one he offers here today allegedly rely on these decisions. But when it came time to put this amendment down on paper, he decided he was only interested in one kind of benefit—the grants—completely ignoring the court's specific finding that tax-exemptions are a form of subsidy which have much the same effect as a cash grant. What a curious oversight. The court names just two